



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/517,977	03/03/2000	Dean Boyd	20113.0001U2	5716

24633 7590 09/23/2003

HOGAN & HARTSON LLP
IP GROUP, COLUMBIA SQUARE
555 THIRTEENTH STREET, N.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20004

EXAMINER

COSIMANO, EDWARD R

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3629

DATE MAILED: 09/23/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/517,977

Applicant(s)

BOYD ET AL.

Examiner

Edward R. Cosimano

Art Unit

3629

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 March 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-34 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) none is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-34 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 03 March 2000 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☒ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 4-6.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Art Unit: 3629

1. Applicant should note the changes to patent practice and procedure:

A) effective December 01, 1997 as published in the Federal Register, Vol 62, No. 197, Friday October 10, 1997;

B) effective November 07, 2000 as published in the Federal Register, Vol 65, No. 54603, September 08, 2000; and

C) Amendment in revised format, Vol. 1267 of the Official Gazette published February 25, 2003.

2. The oath or declaration is defective. A new oath or declaration in compliance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.67(a) identifying this application by its Serial Number and filing date is required. See M.P.E.P. §§ 602.01 and 602.02.

2.1 The oath or declaration is defective because:

A) it does not identify the mailing address of each inventor. A mailing address is an address at which an inventor customarily receives his or her mail and may be either a home or business address. The mailing address should include the ZIP Code designation. The mailing address may be provided in an application data sheet or a supplemental oath or declaration. See 37 CFR 1.63(c) and 37 CFR 1.76.

3. The drawings are objected to because

A) the drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims, therefore, the subject matter of claim(s) 1-34 in the form of a flowchart of the claimed limitations or process steps of the claimed limitations, must be shown in the drawings as required by 37 CFR § 1.83(a) or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s) (note: no new matter should be entered).

B) The subject matter of this application admits of illustration by a drawing to facilitate understanding of the invention. Applicant is required to furnish a drawing under 37 C.F.R. § 1.81(c).

3.1 A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Art Unit: 3629

3.2 Applicant is required to submit a proposed drawing correction in reply to this Office action. However, formal correction of the noted defect may be deferred until after the examiner has considered the proposed drawing correction. Failure to timely submit the proposed drawing correction will result in the abandonment of the application.

4. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

A) the following errors have been noted in the specification:

(1) page 25 of the disclosure contains two illustrations in the form of line graphs, which are not one of the expressly permitted illustrations that are permitted by 37 CFR § 1.58(a).

Appropriate correction is required.

5. The specification and drawings have not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification or drawings. Applicant should note the requirements of 37 CFR § 1.74, § 1.75, § 1.84(o,p(5)), § 1.121(a)-1.121(f) & § 1.121(h)-1.121(i).

6. Claim 30 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, fourth paragraph, as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim.

6.1 Since claim 30 is identical or claim 16 and both claims 16 & 30 depend from claim 15, claim 30 fails to further limit the invention recited in claim 16.

7. Claims 1-34 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of double patenting over claims 1-44 of copending Application No. 09/517,783. This is a provisional double patenting rejection since the conflicting claims have not yet been patented.

7.1 The subject matter claimed in the instant application is fully disclosed in the referenced copending application and would be covered by any patent granted on that copending application since the referenced copending application and the instant application are claiming common subject matter, as follows:

A) determining the costs associated with an item as well as the price associated with the item;

B) determining the competitor's net price; and

C) determining the probability of winning a bid based using a market response model.

7.2 The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

7.3 A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

7.4 Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

8. 35 U.S.C. § 101 reads as follows:

"Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title".

8.1 Claims 1-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the invention as claimed is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

8.1.1 Although the instant claims recite:

1) a method, (claims 1-34), which has a practical application in the technological arts, and

2) which does not define either a computer program, a data structure, non-functional descriptive material, (i.e. mere data) or a natural phenomenon,
the instant claims merely define a series of steps to be performed on a computer.

Art Unit: 3629

8.1.2 In regard to claims 1-34, the invention as set forth in these claims merely describes the calculation or determination of an abstract pure number. However, as recited in these claims the determined abstract number is not tangibly used in a concrete manner so as to produce a concrete and tangible result with in the technological arts.

8.1.3 It is further noted that applicant has not claimed a specific process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, which is either altered or changed or modified by abstract number calculated by the invention recited in claims.

8.1.4 It is further noted that applicant has not claimed either:

A) pre computer processing, since the claims fail to recited that the data, which originates from an unknown source, is manipulated or changed before it is processed, or

B) post computer processing, since the claims fail to recited that the data which represents the result of the claimed manipulation is either manipulated or used or changed by any device after it has been processed.

8.1.5 In view of the above, the invention of claims 1-34 merely manipulates the abstract idea of calculating a price which as recited in the claims is not used.

8.1.6 In view of the above, it is further noted that the invention of claims 1-34 lacks a claimed practical application since the claimed invention:

A) is not used by any system or device or method outside of the claimed invention,

in a concrete and tangible manner, (note In re Beauregard 35 USPQ2d 1383 (CAFC 1995) and the associated claims of U.S. Patent 5,710,578; and State Street Bank & Trust Co. v. Signature Financial Group Inc. 47 USPQ2d 1596 (CAFC 1998)).

8.1.7 It is further noted that the type/nature of either the data or the calculated numbers does not affect the operation of the claimed invention and hence are considered to be non function descriptive material, (note In re Gulack, 703 F.2d 1381, 1385, 217 USPQ 401, 404 (Fed. Cir. 1983)).

8.1.7 Hence, claims 1-34 are directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Art Unit: 3629

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103 which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

(c) Subject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under subsection (f) or (g) of section 102 of this title, shall not preclude patentability under this section where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person.

9.1 Claims 1-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Burns et al (5,189,606) in view of Messmer et al (2001/0037278).

9.1.1 In regard to claims 1-34, Burns et al ('606) discloses a bidding system in which historical data and models are used to:

- A) determine the costs associated with an item for which the bid is to be made;
- B) determine of a price of an item that includes an associated profit for the item for which the bid is to be made;
- C) consider the affects of the competitor's bids; and
- D) determine the actual bid or target price to be used.

9.1.2 Burns et al ('606) does not suggest determining the probability of a winning bid or the use of an optimal bid. However, Messmer et al ('278) discloses in the environment of determining the optimum bid in a competitive bidding environment by considering of the competition when determining a target price/bid and the use of statistical analysis to determine the probability of the bid winning. Since a company would not want to submit a bid that is not competitive and would certainly lose, it would have been obvious tone of ordinary skill at the time the invention was made that estimating and bidding system of Burns et al ('606) could be

Art Unit: 3629

modified to consider the probability of winning when submitting an optimum bid for an item as taught by Messmer et al ('278).

10. The examiner has cited prior art of interest, for example:

A) either Foley (5,249,120) or Fad et al (5,793,632) or Pan et al (5,960,417) or Elliott (6,446,053) or Boyd et al (2002/0123930) which disclose that the process of determining a target price for an item involves the consideration of the costs and profit associated with the item.

B) either Burnett et al or Vivona (5,960,407) or Boyd et al (WO 00/52605) or Kocher (2003/0061119) or Delurgio et al (6,553,352) or Walser et al (2003/0110066) which disclose that the process of determining a bid price for an item involves the consideration of the costs and profit associated with the item and a consideration of the bids of the competitors.

11. Reference AV on the PTO-1449 filed October 16, 2000, has not been considered, since this reference can not be found in the instant case file.

12. The shortened statutory period of response is set to expire 3 (three) months from the mailing date of this Office action.

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Edward Cosimano whose telephone number is (703) 305-9783. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Thursday from 7:30am to 6:00pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Weiss, can be reached on (703)-308-2702. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1113.

13.1 The fax phone number for UNOFFICIAL/DRAFT FAXES is (703) 746-7240.

13.2 The fax phone number for OFFICIAL FAXES is (703) 872-9306.

13.3 The fax phone number for AFTER FINAL FAXES is (703) 872-9306.

09/15/03



Edward R. Cosimano
Primary Examiner A.U. 3629